

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, regarding claims 1 and 5, which are the only independent claims of the application, the phrase "such as" is deemed to render the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention.

This rejection has been obviated by amending claims 1 and 5 to delete the phrase "such as a smart pig".

Newly added multiple dependent claim 8 has been added to limit the remaining claims to said device being a "smart pig".

Independent claim 5 has been amended at line 9, as suggested by the Examiner.

The amendments presented herein are believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of claims 1-7, as presently constituted, and newly added claim 8, with a view to allowance, is earnestly solicited.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: May 13, 2004

By: 

Clair X. Mullen, Jr.

Reg. No. 20,348